

EXHIBIT E

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DIGITAL VERIFICATION

SYSTEMS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 5:22-cv-00686-JWH-SP

ENCYRO, INC.,

Defendant.

ZOOM DEPOSITION OF LEIGH ROTHSCILD

VOLUME 1 - PAGES 1-130

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2022

NORTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

Reported by: Marilyn Hoover, RPR

California CSR No. 8841

1 BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to the Federal
2 Rules of Civil Procedure, the Zoom video deposition of
3 LEIGH ROTHSCCHILD was taken before Marilynn Hoover,
4 California CSR No. 8841; on Wednesday, October 12,
5 2022, commencing at the hour of 1:06 p.m.; the witness
6 testifying from North Miami, Florida.

7
8 APPEARANCES

9 PALAVAN & MOORE, PLLC

10 BY MR. SHEA PALAVAN

11 5353 West Alabama Street, Suite 303

12 Houston, Texas 77056

13 Telephone: 832-800-4133

14 E-mail: Shea@palavan.com

15 On behalf of Plaintiff

16
17 LAMKIN IP DEFENSE

18 BY MS. RACHAEL D. LAMKIN

19 One Harbor Drive, Suite 300

20 Sausalito, California 94965

21 Telephone: 916-747-6091

22 E-mail: RDL@lamkinipdefense.com

23 On behalf of Defendant

24
25 ALSO PRESENT: Sugouri Batra, in-house counsel

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EXAMINATION INDEX

PAGE

Examination by Ms. Lamkin 5

* * *

EXHIBIT INDEX

EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Exhibit 1	U.S. Patent No. 9,054,860	15
Exhibit 2	USPTO patent assignments	34
Exhibit 3	Patent assignments	36
Exhibit 4	2009 LLC annual report	36
Exhibit 5	Patent assignment	39
Exhibit 6	Patent assignment	40
Exhibit 7	Texas franchise tax public information report	43
Exhibit 8	Patent Asset Management team	45
Exhibit 11	2021 Florida limited liability company annual report for Patent Asset Management	67
Exhibit 12	2021 Florida limited liability company annual report for Matthew Inventions	70
Exhibit 13	Appeal brief	74
Exhibit 14	Excel file: Rothschild cases	73

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (CONT.)		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
3	Exhibit 18	Certificate of formation of	
4		Rothschild Connected Devices	
5		Innovations LLC	80
6	Exhibit 19	Texas secretary of state document	
7		in re Rothschild Connected Devices	
8		Innovations LLC	82
9	Exhibit 20	Declaration of Leigh Rothschild	83
10	Exhibit 21	Motion for order to show cause	87
11	Exhibit 22	Report and recommendation	87
12	Exhibit 23	Complaint for patent infringement	98
13	Exhibit 24	Texas secretary of state document	
14		in re Rothschild Digital	
15		Confirmation LLC	100
16	Exhibit 25	11/01/2021 letter	102
17	Exhibit 26	11/01/2021 letter	104
18	Exhibit 27	2021 Florida limited liability	
19		company annual report for LMR	
20		Inventions LLC	41
21	Exhibit 28	Plaintiff's objections and responses	
22		to defendant's first set of written	
23		discovery	120
24	Exhibit 29	Affidavit of Leigh Rothschild	121
25	Exhibit 30	Initial infringement chart	124

1 WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2022; NORTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

2 LEIGH ROTHSCCHILD,

3 called as a witness, being duly sworn on oath, was
4 examined and did testify as follows:

5 THE STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER: Thank you. You 13:06
6 may begin. 13:06

7 EXAMINATION 13:06

8 BY MS. LAMKIN: 13:06

9 Q. Good morning, and afternoon, Mr. Rothschild. 13:06

10 A. Thank you. 13:06

11 Q. My name is Rachael Lamkin and I represent 13:06
12 the defendant in this action. 13:06

13 I see you have two attorneys with you here 13:06
14 today; is that correct? 13:06

15 A. Yes. 13:06

16 Q. Okay. Mr. Palavan is your outside counsel; 13:06
17 correct? 13:06

18 A. That is correct. 13:06

19 Q. Okay. And Ms. Batra, can you please state 13:06
20 her role for the record. 13:06

21 A. Yes. She is general counsel to the company. 13:06

22 Q. "The company" being plaintiff, what I will 13:06
23 call DVS for your deposition. Is that okay? 13:06

24 A. Yes. She's general counsel to the 13:06
25 plaintiff. 13:06

1 A. It is. 13:24

2 Q. Is this the patent that you reviewed on your 13:24

3 Zoom call with your counsel, Mr. Palavan and 13:24

4 Ms. Batra? 13:24

5 A. It is. 13:24

6 Q. If you could please turn to the column 1 of 13:24

7 the '860 patent, Mr. Rothschild. 13:24

8 Mr. Rothschild, who drafted -- 13:25

9 A. Excuse me, Ms. Lamkin. I need time to get 13:25

10 there. I'm not quite there. Thank you. 13:25

11 Q. Um-hum. 13:25

12 A. I'm there now, Ms. Lamkin. 13:25

13 Q. Mr. Rothschild, who drafted column 1 of the 13:25

14 '860 patent? 13:25

15 A. The draft was done by patent prosecution 13:25

16 counsel. 13:25

17 Q. Did you review column 1 of the '860 patent 13:25

18 during prosecution? 13:25

19 A. I do not recall with specificity. 13:25

20 I would point out, I would add to that 13:25

21 answer, if I may, Ms. Lamkin: That was many, many 13:25

22 years ago, I believe 2008, so -- I believe, so many 13:25

23 years ago. More than ten? Yes, 2008. I'm looking at 13:25

24 the patent to get that date. So that is, by my 13:25

25 calculations, approximately 14 years ago. 13:26

1 Q. You did review this patent with your counsel 13:26
2 and last night; correct? 13:26
3 A. We looked at the patent last night, 13:26
4 Ms. Lamkin. We -- We reviewed the patent last night. 13:26
5 Q. And you also reviewed the patent on your own 13:26
6 last night? 13:26
7 A. Yes. 13:26
8 Q. Okay. Mr. Rothschild, how would you explain 13:26
9 what a module generating assembly in the '860 patent 13:26
10 is to a jury? 13:26
11 A. I would have to look, Ms. Lamkin -- Well, I 13:26
12 would answer by telling you that -- I'm sorry. Could 13:26
13 you repeat the term again, Ms. Lamkin. I'd appreciate 13:26
14 that. 13:26
15 Q. Module generating assembly. 13:26
16 A. I would say that a module generating 13:26
17 assembly is what it says in the specification of the 13:26
18 9,054,860 patent. 13:26
19 Q. Yes, sir. I'm asking, in your words, how 13:27
20 you would explain that term to a jury. 13:27
21 A. I would explain it to the jury that it is 13:27
22 what it says in the specification as published in the 13:27
23 9,054,860 patent. 13:27
24 Q. So you have -- Other than how a module 13:27
25 generating assembly is in the patent, you have no 13:27

1 other -- Strike that. 13:27

2 You will solely rely upon the patent's 13:27

3 description for module generating assembly in this 13:27

4 litigation? 13:27

5 A. Could you rephrase the question, please, or 13:27

6 repeat the question. 13:27

7 Q. You will solely rely on the '860 patent's 13:27

8 description of a module generating assembly in this 13:27

9 litigation? 13:28

10 A. I will answer your question by saying: What 13:28

11 is -- What is that module? That the module is what it 13:28

12 says it is in the patent specification of the 13:28

13 9,054,860 patent, the asserted patent, the patent used 13:28

14 in the complaint, filed in the complaint. 13:28

15 Q. Sir, my question is this: My client is 13:28

16 entitled to know how you, as the named inventor, would 13:28

17 describe a module generating assembly to the jury. 13:28

18 You understand that? 13:28

19 A. I'm not an attorney, Ms. Lamkin, so I don't 13:28

20 know what your client is entitled to or not. I 13:28

21 honestly don't. So my counsel may know, you may know, 13:28

22 but I don't have any idea what your client is entitled 13:28

23 to. 13:28

24 I will tell you that the specification 13:28

25 speaks to all kinds of terminology, and I would tell 13:28

1 line 46. 14:00

2 Q. I want to be perfectly clear that what I'm 14:00

3 asking for is not where in the specification the term 14:00

4 "module generating assembly" is mentioned. 14:00

5 What I'm asking for specifically is: Where 14:00

6 in the specification is the teaching or the 14:00

7 description that corresponds to the claim limitation 14:00

8 I've read into the record at column 9, lines 9 14:00

9 through 11? 14:01

10 That's the only thing I want, is: Where in 14:01

11 the specification is the teaching that corresponds to 14:01

12 the limitation at column 9, lines 9 through 11? 14:01

13 A. Great. Great. I would tell you, in answer 14:01

14 to your question, that I find information -- I don't 14:01

15 know whether -- what the term -- not being an attorney 14:01

16 or a patent attorney, what the term "teaching" means; 14:01

17 but I find information on module generating assembly 14:01

18 in column 1, line 46, where it says -- and I will read 14:01

19 slowly. 14:01

20 Q. It's okay, Mr. Rothschild. It's okay. You 14:01

21 don't have to read into the record. 14:01

22 If you'll just give me the citations. 14:01

23 Column 1, starting at which line? 14:01

24 A. Line 45 to 48 -- to 49. 14:01

25 Q. Okay. And can you please provide any other 14:02

1 citations to the specification that describe the 14:02
2 limitation disclosed at column 9, lines 9 through 11? 14:02
3 A. Yes. I find the term "module generating 14:02
4 assembly" in line -- approximately line column 2, 14:02
5 line 17 through 24. 14:02
6 Q. Great. Others? 14:02
7 A. I find the term "module generating assembly" 14:02
8 in column 3, line 46 to 55. 14:02
9 Q. Thank you. Any others? 14:03
10 A. I find the term "module generating assembly" 14:03
11 in the specification of the '860 patent in column 5, 14:03
12 line -- approximately line 5 through line 15 -- I'm 14:03
13 sorry -- line 14. 14:03
14 Q. Thank you, sir. Any others? 14:03
15 A. I find the term "module generating assembly" 14:03
16 in column 5 of the '860 patent, in line 22 -- 14:03
17 approximately line 22 to line 26. 14:03
18 Q. Thank you. Others? 14:03
19 A. I find the term "module generating assembly" 14:03
20 in the '860 patent -- asserted patent, in column 5, 14:04
21 line 30 through line 35. 14:04
22 Q. Thank you. Any others? 14:04
23 A. I find the term "module generating assembly" 14:04
24 in the '860 patent in line, approximately, 53 -- 14:04
25 column 5, line 53 through line approximately 60 -- 14:04

1 fifty -- correcting that to line 59. 14:04

2 Q. Thank you, Mr. Rothschild. 14:04

3 And any other discussions of citation -- 14:04

4 Sorry. Strike that. 14:04

5 Any other discussions in the specification 14:04

6 of the '860 patent for the limitation disclosed at 14:04

7 column 9, lines 9 through 11? 14:04

8 A. Ms. Lamkin, I can't say with specificity if 14:05

9 there's any others; but those are ones that I noted 14:05

10 when I reviewed the patent a few minutes ago during 14:05

11 our break, that are contained within the 14:05

12 specifications. To be clear, there may be others. 14:05

13 Q. Okay. Please take your time, sir. I need 14:05

14 you to highlight all of them. Take it -- This is why 14:05

15 we're here: You're the named inventor on this patent 14:05

16 and we need to understand it. 14:05

17 So I need to know, in your opinion, all 14:05

18 discussions in the specification for the limitation at 14:05

19 column 9, lines 9 through 11. 14:05

20 A. Those are the ones, Ms. Lamkin, that I've -- 14:05

21 that I have found. 14:05

22 Q. Okay. Thank you. And in the citations that 14:05

23 you have just provided, can you find any discussion of 14:05

24 the specific language -- not just the term "module 14:05

25 generating assembly," but the specific language -- 14:05

1 appearing in the limitation at column 9, lines 9 14:05
2 through 11? 14:06
3 A. I would believe the answer -- Strike that. 14:06
4 The answer would be that the teaching or 14:06
5 that the wording is as contained in the specification. 14:06
6 Q. I'm sorry. I don't understand. I don't 14:06
7 understand that. 14:06
8 MR. PALAVAN: One second. One second. 14:06
9 Leigh, can you just move your camera to your 14:06
10 right. You keep leaning to the right, so if you could 14:06
11 just move it to the right. 14:06
12 THE WITNESS: I'm leaning to the right, 14:06
13 Mr. Palavan, because I'm looking at the patent. 14:06
14 MR. PALAVAN: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. 14:06
15 So can you just shift your thing to the right? Yeah, 14:06
16 there you go. Perfect. 14:06
17 THE WITNESS: Does that help? 14:06
18 MR. PALAVAN: Yeah. That way, Ms. Hoover is 14:06
19 not having to go like this in following you. 14:06
20 THE WITNESS: Perfect. Happy to 14:06
21 accommodate. 14:06
22 Could you rephrase the question. Could you 14:06
23 restate the question, Ms. Lamkin. 14:06
24 Q. BY MS. LAMKIN: I'm asking you to explain 14:06
25 your response to the question. 14:06

1 Ms. Hoover, can you reread his response. 14:06

2 (Record read.) 14:06

3 THE WITNESS: I'm asking Ms. Lamkin to 14:07

4 repeat the question, not my answer, Ms. Hoover and 14:07

5 Ms. Lamkin. 14:07

6 MS. LAMKIN: Okay. I'll do it. 14:07

7 Q. BY MS. LAMKIN: In the citations that you 14:07

8 just provided, please point out any discussion of the 14:07

9 specific language in column 9, lines 9 through 11. 14:07

10 A. My answer would be that the wording in the 14:07

11 specifications speaks for itself. I have no 14:07

12 interpretation to provide. 14:07

13 Q. I'm not asking for interpretation, sir. I'm 14:07

14 asking you to point to a specific discussion of the 14:07

15 language in column 9, lines 9 through 11, in the 14:07

16 citations you've provided. 14:07

17 A. My answer would be that the wording in the 14:07

18 specification speaks for itself. 14:07

19 Q. And can you point to any language in the 14:07

20 specification that discusses "a module generating 14:08

21 assembly structured to receive at least one 14:08

22 verification data element corresponding to the at 14:08

23 least one entity"? 14:08

24 A. My answer would be, as I repeat it again, 14:08

25 Ms. Lamkin -- I'll repeat it again -- that the wording 14:08

1 Q. Is that an accurate statement in your 16:26
2 declaration? 16:26
3 A. Yes. 16:26
4 Q. Just read it into the record: "I have more 16:26
5 than 20 years of experience involving claim 16:26
6 construction and claim charts in connection with 16:26
7 patent litigation. I also personally analyzed the 16:27
8 claims and the claim constructions in this case prior 16:27
9 to the filing of the lawsuit," unquote. 16:27
10 That statement's accurate, Mr. Rothschild? 16:27
11 A. I believe it's accurate as to this case, as 16:27
12 to the -- 16:27
13 Q. Do you -- Please, sir. 16:27
14 A. I believe it's accurate -- Thank you. I 16:27
15 believe it's accurate as to this case, in the case of 16:27
16 -- and accurate as to this patent, 8,788,090. 16:27
17 Q. Okay. And then the next page, let me know 16:27
18 when you've read that. 16:27
19 A. I've completed reading it, Ms. Lamkin. 16:28
20 Q. Okay. Is there anything in this declaration 16:28
21 that you -- that is inaccurate, to the best of your 16:28
22 recollection? 16:28
23 A. There is not, to the best of my 16:28
24 recollection. 16:28
25 Q. Okay. Do you recall in the RCDI matter that 16:28

1 the District Court ultimately awarded attorneys' fees 16:28
2 against RCDI? 16:28
3 A. I recall that in the -- in this matter, the 16:28
4 District Court did not award attorneys' fees against 16:28
5 RCDI. Your statement is not correct. 16:29
6 What happened, to the best of my 16:29
7 recollection, is the court denied attorneys' fees. 16:29
8 The other side appealed, to the best of my knowledge, 16:29
9 to the federal circuit. The circuit came back and 16:29
10 contradicted or disagreed with the federal district 16:29
11 judge and told the district judge -- told the district 16:29
12 judge to award attorneys' fees. And, at that point, 16:29
13 the attorneys -- I'm sorry -- the federal district 16:29
14 judge followed the circuit's recommendation and 16:29
15 awarded attorneys' fees against the plaintiff, 16:29
16 Rothschild Connected Device Innovation. 16:29
17 Q. And then when the District Court awarded 16:29
18 attorneys' fees against RCDI, did RCDI pay the 16:29
19 attorneys' fees? 16:29
20 A. RCDI attempted to negotiate to pay the 16:29
21 attorneys' fees with the plaintiff. The plaintiff did 16:30
22 not accept, to the best of my knowledge -- I'm sorry. 16:30
23 The defendant. Excuse me. The defendant did not 16:30
24 accept our offer to pay. 16:30
25 RCDI was prepared to pay attorneys' fees in 16:30

1 some amount, and was negotiating back and forth for 16:30
2 lower amounts, which was agreed to at some point by 16:30
3 the defendant. But a solution -- We were in 16:30
4 negotiations, continual negotiations. A settlement 16:30
5 was never reached. RCDI never refused to pay 16:30
6 attorneys' fees at any point, to the best of my 16:30
7 knowledge. That was done by my general counsel, at 16:30
8 the time, in the negotiation process. 16:30
9 So your statement about refusing to pay 16:31
10 attorneys' fees, or didn't pay them, is not correct, 16:31
11 Ms. Lamkin. 16:31
12 MS. LAMKIN: I'm going mark as Exhibits 21 16:31
13 and 22 -- 16:31
14 THE WITNESS: I'd also point out for the 16:31
15 record, for your further knowledge, Ms. Lamkin, that a 16:31
16 judgment was never obtained, to the best of my 16:31
17 knowledge, against the company. 16:31
18 The court was in fact inquiring, the federal 16:31
19 district court, why the -- why the defendant did not 16:31
20 go for a judgment in this matter, and the defendant 16:31
21 said at this point they didn't want a judgment. It 16:31
22 might have been because there was negotiations ongoing 16:31
23 and that the matter was supposed to be settled between 16:31
24 the parties -- which is what the court, I believe, 16:32
25 from my point of view, was hoping for. 16:32

1	A. Correct.	16:33
2	Q. Okay. Exhibit 21 goes on to say at	16:34
3	paragraph 2: "As part of the fee submission, ADS	16:34
4	requested that this court hold Mr. Rothschild jointly	16:34
5	and severally liable with RCDI."	16:34
6	Quote: "So as not to require further	16:34
7	unnecessary litigation, ADS seeks the award of fees	16:34
8	and expenses to be entered jointly and severally	16:34
9	against the entity RCDI and its sole member, Leigh M.	16:34
10	Rothschild, as the two are one in the same."	16:34
11	Does that refresh your recollection that ADS	16:34
12	tried to name you as a party in this matter,	16:34
13	Mr. Rothschild?	16:34
14	A. That's correct.	16:34
15	Q. And then in paragraph 3 of Exhibit 21, it	16:34
16	says: "On November 8th, 2017, the court ordered the	16:34
17	fee order."	16:35
18	Quote: "It is ordered that Rothschild	16:35
19	Connected Devices Innovations ('Rothschild') shall pay	16:35
20	ADS attorneys' fees and costs."	16:35
21	Again, is that consistent with your	16:35
22	recollection that ADS -- that RCDI was ordered to pay	16:35
23	attorneys' fees and costs in this matter?	16:35
24	A. That's correct.	16:35
25	Q. In paragraph 4, it says: "This court	16:35

1 and five dollars as its assets? 16:36

2 A. I do not recall that. I do not know if 16:37

3 that's correct. 16:37

4 Q. Okay. Do you have any reason to doubt that 16:37

5 representation by RCDI at the time? 16:37

6 A. I have every reason to doubt it, because I 16:37

7 don't have any knowledge of it. 16:37

8 Q. Okay. "As of the date of this motion, RCDI 16:37

9 has failed to comply with the fee order, as RCDI has 16:37

10 neither paid the amount directed to be paid ... nor 16:37

11 has RCDI made any notification to this court." 16:37

12 Is that consistent with your recollection of 16:37

13 the matter, sir? 16:37

14 A. It is not consistent, in the fact that I 16:37

15 testified earlier that negotiations were ongoing, 16:37

16 where we made several offers to pay from our general 16:37

17 counsel at the time to the company. Numerous 16:37

18 discussions, in my memory, were held and negotiations 16:37

19 went back and forth in terms of payment, right until 16:38

20 the case ended. 16:38

21 Q. Do you have any recollection of RCDI ever 16:38

22 paying to ADS the ordered fee award? 16:38

23 A. I do not. 16:38

24 Q. Turn to Exhibit 22. 16:38

25 A. But I would add to the statement that a 16:38

1 judgment was never entered in this matter, as I 16:38
2 testified to earlier, that the court was asking why 16:38
3 the plaintiff was -- why the defendant, excuse me, was 16:38
4 not seeking a judgment. No answer, to my knowledge, 16:38
5 was given. And I again repeat for the record that 16:38
6 negotiations were ongoing, where offers were made to 16:38
7 pay this amount from RCDI to the defendant. 16:38

8 Q. Mr. Rothschild, I've personally reviewed the 16:38
9 docket. I don't see any evidence of that. 16:38

10 Do you think you can produce that evidence, 16:38
11 sometime after this deposition, for my review? 16:38

12 A. Many years ago. I have no knowledge whether 16:38
13 it would be evidence or not. The person that was the 16:38
14 general counsel at the time no longer works for us and 16:39
15 hasn't for many, many years. He would hold those 16:39
16 records, if there were any records. What happened to 16:39
17 them, I don't know. I've never seen anything in that 16:39
18 regard. But I am testifying hereto that there were 16:39
19 numerous conversations that were held, as reported to 16:39
20 me by counsel, to pay. 16:39

21 Q. Looking now at Exhibit 22, an order dated 16:39
22 August 13th, 2019. 16:39

23 Do you understand, sir, that a report and 16:39
24 recommendation is an order from the court? 16:39

25 A. I'm sorry. Say again. 16:39

1 I do know that the court specifically told, 16:43
2 as I previously testified, that I would not be brought 16:43
3 into the case until service was effectuated and a 16:43
4 hearing would be held on the matter to determine the 16:43
5 merits of bringing me in. And -- 16:43

6 Q. And -- 16:43

7 A. Excuse me. And I believe the record 16:44
8 supports that. 16:44

9 Q. Did either RCDI or you personally ever pay 16:44
10 any portion of the court order awarding attorneys' 16:44
11 fees in this matter? 16:44

12 A. I repeat my testimony that no payment was 16:44
13 made for RCDI, and that ongoing negotiations were 16:44
14 being held to effectuate payment, but a judgment was 16:44
15 never filed by the court, even though the court was 16:44
16 wondering if they were going to seek a judgment. 16:44

17 I also repeat my testimony -- I also state 16:44
18 for the record that I was never asked by the court to 16:44
19 pay anything; that the court was -- the court was 16:44
20 asking for me to be served, to decide whether they 16:44
21 were to bring me into the case. 16:44

22 Q. Mr. Rothschild, you have a right, and I'm -- 16:44
23 I'm perfectly happy to let you explain your answer, 16:44
24 but I first need an answer. 16:44

25 So it's a yes-or-no question, and then, 16:44

1 please, you have a right to explain yourself. 16:45

2 Did RCDI ever pay any attorneys' fees 16:45

3 pursuant to the order ordering attorneys' fees to be 16:45

4 paid? 16:45

5 A. No, we did not. 16:45

6 Q. Okay. And did you personally ever pay any 16:45

7 attorneys' fees based on the order from the court 16:45

8 ordering that attorneys' fees be paid? 16:45

9 A. No. And to explain, as you said you would 16:45

10 currently allow me to explain: I was never ordered by 16:45

11 the court to pay anything to RC -- from RCDI or pay 16:45

12 anything to -- I'm sorry. I was never ordered by the 16:45

13 court, me personally, to pay any sum of money to the 16:45

14 defendant. 16:45

15 Q. And your recollection is that's because you 16:45

16 were not properly served; right? 16:45

17 A. My recollection would be that I was not 16:45

18 properly served, and the court had stated that I would 16:45

19 need to be properly served and that the court would 16:45

20 have a hearing to determine the merit of bringing me 16:45

21 into the case. 16:46

22 Q. You could have paid the money; right? You 16:46

23 knew the court ordered attorneys' fees paid, and 16:46

24 either you or RCDI could have paid the money; right? 16:46

25 A. Absolutely incorrect. 16:46

1 Q. Why not? 16:46

2 A. As far as me paying the money, I had no 16:46

3 obligation, as I just said, to pay any money. It 16:46

4 would be absolutely not the case that I had any 16:46

5 obligation, any legal obligation, at that point, to 16:46

6 pay. And as I've testified -- So that's the answer to 16:46

7 the second question, as to why I didn't pay. I had no 16:46

8 legal obligation to pay. 16:46

9 Your first question, I believe, Ms. Lamkin, 16:46

10 is why RCDI did not pay. As I've testified to now 16:46

11 numerous times today, RCDI was in negotiation with the 16:46

12 defendant as to effectuate a payment settlement. 16:46

13 Q. The court issued an order ordering RCDI to 16:46

14 pay attorneys' fees; correct? 16:46

15 A. I believe so. 16:46

16 Q. And RCDI did not honor that order; correct? 16:47

17 A. I don't know if the order was not honored. 16:47

18 That would be a legal determination. But I will tell 16:47

19 you, and I've testified and I will testify again, that 16:47

20 the company RCDI was in negotiation to pay to the 16:47

21 defendant an amount of money that would satisfy them 16:47

22 in this matter. 16:47

23 MS. LAMKIN: I'm going to mark Exhibit 23 16:47

24 the complaint from case number 1:19-cv-01109, 16:47

25 Rothschild Digital Confirmation v. CompanyCam. 16:48

1 (Exhibit 23 marked.) 16:48

2 Q. BY MS. LAMKIN: Have you ever seen 16:48

3 Exhibit 23 before, Mr. Rothschild? And I'm happy to 16:48

4 flip through it if that would help you. 16:48

5 A. Well, Ms. Lamkin, for the record, I'm only 16:48

6 seeing the first two sentences after the title page, 16:48

7 "plaintiff ... through its undersigned attorneys" -- 16:48

8 and now you're scrolling. 16:48

9 Q. Correct. Would you like me to scroll 16:48

10 through the document for you, sir? 16:48

11 A. Yes, I would. Yep. 16:48

12 Q. Okay. I'll just do it page by page, and you 16:48

13 tell me when you're ready for the next page. 16:48

14 A. Ms. Lamkin, are you asking me to read each 16:48

15 page, or you just want me to kind of quickly scroll 16:48

16 through it? 16:48

17 Q. I'm sure not, sir. I'm just -- Whatever you 16:48

18 need to tell -- to ascertain whether or not you've 16:48

19 seen this document before. 16:48

20 A. I don't recollect with specificity whether 16:48

21 I've seen the document before. 16:48

22 Q. Okay. In general, do you review the 16:49

23 complaints before they're filed? 16:49

24 Let me ask that a better way, sir. That's a 16:49

25 terrible question. 16:49

1 A. Sometimes I do, sometimes I don't. I will 16:49
2 tell you that I rely upon my attorneys to file a 16:49
3 correct complaint. 16:49
4 Q. Do you recall this case, RDC v. CompanyCam? 16:49
5 A. There is a recollection but not with 16:49
6 specificity. 16:49
7 Q. What do you remember about this case? 16:49
8 A. I remember that you were counsel, I believe, 16:49
9 for the defendant. 16:49
10 Q. Do you remember anything else? 16:49
11 A. I remember that a settlement was achieved, 16:49
12 no money was paid by either side; that counsel -- my 16:49
13 counsel negotiated with you, Ms. Lamkin, and I guess 16:49
14 on behalf of the client -- 16:49
15 Q. Wait, wait. Don't -- If you're about to -- 16:49
16 Don't say any of the terms on the record, because it's 16:49
17 a separate matter. 16:49
18 A. Hmm. Settlement was achieved -- 16:49
19 Q. Okay. Fine. 16:50
20 A. -- to the full satisfaction of all action. 16:50
21 Q. I'm going to move to strike that. It's a 16:50
22 confidential, unrelated matter; so let's just not have 16:50
23 that on the record, please, sir. 16:50
24 Do you recall which entity or persons are 16:50
25 the manager, or were the manager, of RDC? 16:50